



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_45057
Title of the Manuscript:	2D-simulation of Nanopowder High-Speed Compaction
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments		
Minor REVISION comments	Nanopowder compaction has potential wide application in the future material making and fabrication. However, lack the experimental varication is the weakness of the paper, if possible, I suggest author do some experiments to verify the theoretical model. Besides the above mentioned, there are still some grammar errors and unclear figures in the paper. 1. P1 line 30 article? Or particle? Please make sure this word 2. P1 line 32 "However at that quasistatic compaction processes are investigated, " can I replaced this sentence by "However at that quasistatic compaction processes are still to be investigated" 3. P2, line57, what is r in equation (2) 4. P2 line 71 "implied" should be rewrote as "used" 5. p2 line 45 densification rate " v " should be different with line p2 line 72 Poisson ratio v . 6. P3 Fig.1 is unclear. Fig.2-4 is the same as Fig.1 7. P4 Table 1, please keep the number of decimal consistent, such as 9.257 and 10.0; 8. P5 line 183, where p in Eq.(7) is $p(h)$ or not?	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Qiang Li
Department, University & Country	School of Electronic Automaton, Weifang University of Science and Technology, Shandong, China